

REMARKS

The Office examined claims 1-3 and 5-13 and rejected same. With this paper, a terminal disclaimer is provided believed sufficient to overcome all rejections.

Rejections under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting

The Office rejects claims 1-3 and 5-13 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-5 of US Patent No. 5,930,777. With this paper a terminal disclaimer is provided, believed to obviate the grounds for the rejections. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting be withdrawn.

Respectfully submitted,

6 June 2008_____
Date

/James A. Retter/_____
James A. Retter
Registration No. 41,266
Patent Agent for the Applicant

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468-0224

tel: (203) 261-1234
Cust. No.: 004955